

1 THE HONORABLE _____
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12

13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
14 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
15 AT SEATTLE

16 MARY MATSON,
17
18 Plaintiff,

No.

19
20 NOTICE OF REMOVAL
21
22 v.
23
24 UNITED PARCEL SERVICE, INC.,
25
26 Defendant.

27
28 TO THE HONORABLE JUDGES OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR
29 THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON:
30
31

32 Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1332, 1441, and 1446, defendant United Parcel Service ("UPS")
33 removes this action to this Court from the Superior Court of the State of Washington for King
34 County. In support of this Notice, UPS, by its undersigned attorneys, respectfully states:

35
36 1. STATE COURT ACTION
37
38

39 Plaintiff Mary Matson commenced this action on or about July 15, 2010, by filing a
40 Complaint (the "Complaint") in the Superior Court of the State of Washington for King County,
41 where it was assigned Cause No. 10-2-25613-0SEA. The registered agent for UPS was served
42 with the Summons and Complaint on August 23, 2010. See Declaration of Linda Mizumoto
43 ("Mizumoto Decl."), ¶3. UPS's counsel filed Notices of Appearance in Superior Court on
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

1 September 3, 2010 and September 9, 2010. No further proceedings in this matter have been had
 2 in the Superior Court.
 3

4 In the Complaint, plaintiff brings claims for sex discrimination, race discrimination,
 5 retaliation, and wrongful discharge in violation of public policy. See Complaint ¶¶ 11-21.
 6 Plaintiff's claims are brought under the Washington Law Against Discrimination, Chapter 49.60
 7 RCW, and Washington common law. Plaintiff seeks damages, including lost past and future
 8 wages, lost benefits, general damages in an amount to be proven at trial, and attorneys' fees and
 9 costs. See Complaint, ¶¶ 14, 18, 21, and "Prayer for Relief".
 10
 11

12 **2. GROUNDS FOR REMOVAL: Diversity of Citizenship**

13 There is jurisdiction of the federal court in this matter pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332 based
 14 on diversity of citizenship.
 15

16 a. **Diversity of Citizenship.** According to her Complaint, plaintiff is a
 17 resident of Enumclaw, Washington. See Complaint at ¶1. United Parcel Service, Inc. is an Ohio
 18 corporation with its principal place of business in Georgia. See Mizumoto Decl., ¶2. Diversity
 19 of citizenship therefore exists between the parties.
 20

21 b. **Amount in Controversy**

22 The amount in controversy in this matter exceeds \$75,000, exclusive of costs and interest.
 23 Although plaintiff's Complaint does not contain an allegation regarding the specific amount in
 24 controversy, the Court should conclude based on a preponderance of evidence that plaintiff seeks
 25 damages in an amount greater than \$75,000 based on the following:
 26

27 Plaintiff seeks damages for lost past and future wages. See Complaint, ¶¶ 14, 18, 21, and
 28 "Prayer for Relief". At the time of her discharge, plaintiff was working for UPS as a part-time
 29 employee performing both air combination work and ramp work. Mizumoto Decl., ¶ 4.
 30 Plaintiff's pay rate at the time of her discharge on February 4, 2010 was \$22.52 per hour for air
 31 combination work and \$14.70 per hour for ramp work. Id. Based on a part-time schedule of 30
 32 hours per week, plaintiff would have made \$675.60 per week for her air combination work and
 33

34
 35
 36
 37
 38
 39
 40
 41
 42
 43
 44
 45
 46
 47
 48
 49
 50
 51

Perkins Coie LLP
 1201 Third Avenue, Suite 4800
 Seattle, WA 98101-3099
 Phone: 206.359.8000
 Fax: 206.359.9000

1 \$441 per week for her ramp work. Assuming that plaintiff's claim for lost wages extends from
 2 the date of her discharge to a trial date approximately 12 months from the date of filing
 3 (approximately 81 weeks in total), plaintiff's wage loss claim has a potential value ranging from
 4 approximately \$34,721 (wages for ramp work) to \$54,723 (wages for air combination work).
 5
 6

7 Plaintiff also seeks general damages for extreme emotional distress, in an amount to be
 8 proven at trial. Complaint at ¶¶14, 18, 21. These amounts are properly considered part of the
 9 amount in controversy even though the ultimate award cannot be determined with specificity.
 10 See, e.g., Valdez v. Allstate Ins. Co., 372 F.3d 1115, 1117 (9th Cir. 2004) ("Nor does it present
 11 an insurmountable obstacle to quantify the amount at stake when intangible harm is alleged; the
 12 parties need not predict the trier of fact's eventual award with one hundred percent accuracy.").
 13 It is appropriate to consider awards in similar cases in assessing the amount in controversy.
 14

15 Kroske v. U.S. Bank Corp., 432 F.3d 976, 980 (9th Cir. 2005) (holding that the district court
 16 properly considered emotional distress damage awards in similar discrimination cases in
 17 Washington in determining that the amount in controversy exceeded \$75,000), cert. denied, 127
 18 S. Ct. 157 (2006). Juries frequently award substantial amounts of emotional distress or general
 19 damages in employment discrimination and negligent infliction of emotional distress cases. See,
 20 e.g., Passantino v. Johnson & Johnson Consumer Prods. Inc., 212 F.3d 493, 504, 513-14 (9th Cir.
 21 2000) (affirming \$1,000,000 emotional distress award in a discrimination and retaliation case
 22 brought under the WLAD); Robel v. Roundup Corp., 148 Wn.2d 35, 41-42, 59 P.3d 611 (2002)
 23 (\$50,000 general damages award in case for disability discrimination and retaliation under the
 24 WLAD); Hirata v. Evergreen State Ltd. P'ship No. 5, 124 Wn. App. 631, 636, 103 P.3d 812
 25 (2004) (\$75,000 general damages award to each of two plaintiffs in an employment
 26 discrimination and harassment case brought under the WLAD, where one of the plaintiffs was
 27 awarded only \$1,570.80 in back pay); Herring v. Dep't of Soc'l & Health Servs., 81 Wn. App. 1,
 28 13-15, 914 P.2d 67 (1996) (\$550,000 award for non-economic mental distress damages in a suit
 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51

Perkins Coie LLP
 1201 Third Avenue, Suite 4800
 Seattle, WA 98101-3099
 Phone: 206.359.8000
 Fax: 206.359.9000

1 under the WLAD for wrongful termination, discrimination, failure to accommodate, harassment,
 2 and retaliation related to plaintiff's disability).

3 Finally, plaintiff's Complaint also seeks attorneys' fees. Where, as here, attorneys' fees
 4 are recoverable under the applicable state statutes, reasonable attorneys' fees are properly
 5 included in the amount in controversy. Galt G/S v. JSS Scandinavia, 142 F.3d 1150, 1155-56
 6 (9th Cir. 1998) (considering attorneys' fees in determining amount in controversy); Kroske, 432
 7 F.3d at 980 (same); Beaver v. NPC Intern., Inc., 451 F. Supp. 2d 1196, 1198-99 (D.Or. 2006)
 8 (same); Szalay v. Yellow Freight Sys., Inc., 999 F. Supp. 972, 974 (N.D. Ohio 1996) (same),
 9 aff'd by, 127 F.3d 1103 (6th Cir. 1997). As with emotional distress awards, fee awards in
 10 employment discrimination cases are frequently substantial. See, e.g., Hirata, 124 Wn. App. at
 11 636 (fee award of \$271,230); Herring, 81 Wn. App. at 13 (\$267,862.50 fee award). An award of
 12 even *half* the amount of fees awarded in Hirata or Herring would be well over the minimum
 13 amount in controversy.

14 Considering plaintiff's claims for lost wages in conjunction with her claims for lost
 15 benefits, emotional distress damages, and attorneys' fees, there can be no doubt that a reasonable
 16 person would conclude that the amount in controversy here exceeds the \$75,000 required for
 17 diversity jurisdiction. Therefore, based upon a preponderance of the evidence, UPS has satisfied
 18 its burden to establish that the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000. This Court therefore has
 19 diversity jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a).

20 Accordingly, the action is removable pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1441(b) and 1446.

21 **3. Venue.** This Court is the federal District Court of the United States for the
 22 district embracing the place where the state court action is pending and is therefore the
 23 appropriate court for removal pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1441(a).

24 **4. Timely Removal.** This Notice of Removal is filed with the Court within thirty
 25 (30) days after UPS was first served with the Complaint. 28 U.S.C. § 1446(b).

1 **5. State Court Records.** Copies of all process and pleadings filed in this case,
2 Cause No. 10-2-25613-0SEA, including the Complaint, served on defendant and found in the
3 files of the Superior Court of the State of Washington for King County, as of September 22,
4 2010 are attached to the Certification of State Court Record filed with this Notice of Removal.
5
6
7

8 WHEREFORE, UPS prays that the above-entitled action be removed from the Superior
9 Court of Washington for King County to this Court.
10
11

12 DATED: September 22, 2010

13 *s/ Michael T. Reynvaan, WSBA No. 12943*

14 MReynvaan@perkinscoie.com

15 Maralee M. Downey, WSBA No. 38239

16 **Perkins Coie LLP**

17 1201 Third Avenue, Suite 4800

18 Seattle, WA 98101-3099

19 Telephone: 206.359.8000

20 Facsimile: 206.359.9000

21
22 Attorneys for Defendant
23 UNITED PARCEL SERVICE, INC.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

Perkins Coie LLP
1201 Third Avenue, Suite 4800
Seattle, WA 98101-3099
Phone: 206.359.8000
Fax: 206.359.9000

1
2 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**
3
4
5
6
7
8
9

10
11 I certify that on September 22, 2010, I electronically filed the foregoing NOTICE OF
12 REMOVAL with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system, which will send notification
13 of such filing to the following attorney of record. In addition, I caused service to be made on the
14 same attorney(s) of record by the method(s) indicated:
15
16

Peter G. Cogan
Law Offices of Peter G. Cogan
119 First Avenue South, Suite 500
Seattle, WA 98104

Attorneys for Plaintiff

Via Hand Delivery
 Via U.S. Mail, 1st Class, Postage Prepaid
 Via Overnight Delivery
 Via Facsimile
 Via Email
 Via E-filing

17
18
19 I certify under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.
20
21 DATED this 22nd day of September, 2010.
22
23

24 *s/ Janet Davenport*
25 Janet Davenport, Legal Secretary
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

Perkins Coie LLP
1201 Third Avenue, Suite 4800
Seattle, WA 98101-3099
Phone: 206.359.8000
Fax: 206.359.9000

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10 **IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON
FOR KING COUNTY**

11 **MARY MATSON,**

12 Plaintiff

13 vs.

14 **UNITED PARCEL SERVICE, INC.**

15 Defendant

16 No. 10-2-25613-0 SEA

17 COMPLAINT

18 **PARTIES, JURISDICTION, VENUE**

19 1. Plaintiff Mary Matson is a white female resident of Enumclaw, King County,
20 Washington.

21 2. Defendant United Parcel Service, Inc. is an Ohio corporation engaged in the parcel
22 delivery business and is an employer doing business in King County, Washington. Defendant at
23 all times relevant hereto employed eight or more employees in the State of Washington.

24 3. This court has jurisdiction over this matter and venue is proper in this court.

25 **FACTS**

26 4. Defendant employed plaintiff Mary Matson as a "combination worker" whose job

27 PAGE 1

28 **LAW OFFICE OF PETER G. COGAN
119 FIRST AVE. S., STE. 500
SEATTLE, WA 98104
206-382-9896**

1
2
3
4 duties included both sorting packages and delivering parcels. Plaintiff's employment with
5 defendant commenced on or about October 2002.

6 5. At all times relevant hereto plaintiff performed her job duties for defendant in a
7 competent manner.

8 6. During the course of plaintiff's employment defendant discriminated against plaintiff
9 in the terms and conditions of employment on the basis of her sex and/or on the basis of her
10 race.. Plaintiff was subjected by defendant to a hostile work environment on the basis of her sex
11 and/or her race.

12 7. During the course of her employment with defendant, plaintiff opposed and
13 communicated to defendant her opposition to defendant's practices of unlawful discrimination
14 against plaintiff in the terms and conditions of employment on the basis of her sex and/or her
15 race (including her being subjected to a hostile work environment) which practices violated
16 RCW 49.60 *et seq.*

17 8. After plaintiff opposed and communicated to defendant her opposition to defendant's
18 aforementioned employment practices which were in violation of RCW 49.60 *et seq.*, defendant
19 retaliated against plaintiff by discriminating against her in the terms and conditions of
20 employment because of her protected opposition activities aforementioned, including subjecting
21 her to a hostile work environment.

22 9. On or about mid December 2009 one of defendant's male employees assaulted
23 plaintiff on the job, injuring the plaintiff. Plaintiff filed a worker's compensation claim related
24 to the injuries she suffered from the aforementioned assault.

2
3
4 10. On or about February 2, 2010 defendant wrongfully terminated plaintiff's
5 employment on pretextual grounds.

6 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION- VIOLATION OF RCW 49.60.180**

7 11. Paragraphs 1-10 are incorporated by reference as paragraph 11.
8
9 12. Defendant discriminated against plaintiff on the basis of her sex and/or her race in
10 the terms and conditions of her employment in violation of RCW 49.60.180.

11 13. Defendant against discriminated against plaintiff on the basis of her sex in
12 terminating her employment in violation of RCW 49.60.180.

13 14. As a proximate result of defendant's wrongful acts and omissions aforementioned
14 plaintiff has suffered damages, including but not limited to lost pay and benefits and extreme
15 emotional distress, in an amount to be proven at trial.

16 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION- VIOLATION OF RCW 49.60.210**

17 15. Paragraphs 1-10 are hereby incorporated by reference as paragraph 15.
18
19 16. Defendant discriminated against plaintiff in the terms and conditions of her
20 employment because she had opposed practices outlawed by RCW 49.60 *et seq.*, . in violation of
21 RCW 49.60.210.

22 17. Defendant discriminated against plaintiff in terminating her employment because she
23 had opposed practices outlawed by RCW 49.60 *et seq.*, in violation of RCW 49.60.210.

24 18. As a proximate result of defendant's wrongful acts and omissions aforementioned
25 plaintiff has suffered damages, including but not limited to lost pay and benefits and extreme
26 emotional distress in an amount to be proven at trial.

1
2
3
THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION- WRONGFUL TERMINATION IN VIOLATION OF
PUBLIC POLICY

4
5
6 19. Paragraphs 1-10 are incorporated by reference and made paragraph 19.

7
8 20. Defendant terminated plaintiff's employment in retaliation for plaintiff's filing a
9 worker's compensation claim (as referenced in paragraph 9). Said termination constitutes
10 wrongful termination in violation of the public policy of the State of Washington set forth in
RCW 51.48.025.

11
12 21 As a proximate result of defendants' aforementioned wrongful acts, plaintiff
13 suffered damages, including lost wages and benefits, and extreme emotional distress, in an
14 amount to be proven at trial.

15
PRAYER FOR RELIEF

16 WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays for the following relief:

17 1. Order defendant to pay plaintiff back pay, to reinstate plaintiff's employment, or to
18 pay to her front pay until she finds comparable employment elsewhere, and to pay plaintiff
19 compensatory damages in an amount to be proven at trial.

20
21 2. Order defendant to pay plaintiff's reasonable attorneys fees and costs of suit, pursuant
22 to RCW 49.60 *et seq.* and RCW 49.48 *et seq.* and any other basis allowed in law or in equity.

23
24 3. Allow plaintiff to amend her pleadings to conform to the proof at trial.

25
26 4. Order defendant to pay pre-judgment interest on any back wages awarded.

27
28 5. Order such other further relief as the court may deem fair and equitable.

DATED July 14, 2010.

1
2
3
4 /s/
5 Peter G. Cogan, WSBA # 14010
6 Attorney for Plaintiff
7 119 First Ave. S., Suite 500
8 Seattle, WA 98104
9 Ph: (206) 382-9896
10 Fax: (206) 682-3002
11 Email: coganlaw@yahoo.com
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

LAW OFFICE OF PETER G. COGAN
119 FIRST AVE. S., STE 500
SEATTLE, WA 98104
206-382-9896